

IV. MOBILIZING RESOURCES

The ICPD Programme of Action gives prominence to resource mobilization; it calls upon all development partners “to achieve an adequate level of resource mobilization and allocation, at the community, national and international levels, for population programmes and for other related programmes, all of which seek to promote and accelerate social and economic development, improve the quality of life for all, foster equity and full respect for individual rights and, by so doing, contribute to sustainable development”. [1, Chapter XIII, para. 13.21, p. 71] Accordingly, the Programme specifies the financial resources, from domestic and external resources, required for its implementation over a 20-year period. In addition, it also calls upon development partners to support other development programmes to strengthen public health care, improve education and the empowerment of women, generate employment and alleviate poverty.

In 1994, it was estimated that implementation of the “costed package” would require US\$ 17.0 billion globally by the year 2000, US\$ 18.5 billion by 2005, US\$ 20.5 billion by 2010, and US\$ 21.7 billion by 2015. The estimated resources for implementing the Programme of Action in Asian countries for the year 2000 was US\$ 11.0 billion, or approximately two thirds of the global requirement. [17, p. 345] The Programme also recommends that two thirds of the resources should come from domestic sources and the remaining one third from international donor support.

One of the calls included in the Millennium Declaration is for building a global partnership for development. In relation to funding, the Declaration calls for the fulfilment of the agreed target of 0.7 per cent of GNP for official development assistance (ODA). Further, it recommends that 20 per cent of external support and 20 per cent of domestic budgets should be allocated to provide social services.

UNFPA, in cooperation with the Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute, monitors the flow of resources for population programmes using data gathered annually through a survey and from other

sources. A review of resource flows, which was undertaken as part of the Fifth Asian and Pacific Population Conference in 2002, indicated that, “(a)lthough considerable progress has been made and funding for population has increased since the Cairo Conference, actual resources mobilized by 2000, both international assistance and domestic funding, are far below the agreed targets”. [17, p. 347] Also, according to the estimates prepared by UNFPA, global domestic resource flows for the period 1999-2000 amounted to US\$ 8.6 billion, which is roughly three fourths of the global expenditure of US\$ 11.0 billion on population programmes. These statistics indicate that, while there have been shortfalls in both domestic and external funding, the shortfall in external funding (50 per cent) was twice the shortfall in domestic funding (25 per cent). However, the report cautions that domestic resource flows originate only in a few large countries; most developing countries are not able to generate their own resources for population programmes.

Australia, Japan and New Zealand are three countries in the ESCAP region that provide donor support for population activities. Together they accounted for 9 per cent of global population assistance in 2000, with Japan, the second largest donor for population programmes, accounting for a major share of Asia’s contribution. The contributions of Australia, Japan and New Zealand to population activities represented less than 1, 1.5 and 2 per cent respectively of their ODA.

According to the field enquiry, 27 countries reported that there had been an increase in resources, while 10 indicated that there had been no increase. Most of the countries (25 of the 27) also indicated increases in government funding; only a few countries reported increases from private sector or NGO sources. Moreover, most countries (35) also reported that they had mobilized resources from external sources. The field enquiry also shows that 12 countries have introduced cost-recovery approaches, while far fewer countries have introduced social marketing or other such methods. While there has been an increase in resources, in particular from domestic sources, for population and reproductive health programmes in ESCAP member countries, nearly half the countries reported that the increase fell below the amounts needed for implementing the Programme and only a few reported that their needs were met by the available resources.